

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM MEYERS,

Petitioner,

Civil No. 2:10-CV-12003  
HON. LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF

v.

MARY BERGHUIS,

Respondent,

---

**OPINION AND ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS, AND DECLINING TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF  
APPEALABILITY AND LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

William Meyers, (“Petitioner”), confined at the Brooks Correctional Facility in Muskegon Heights, Michigan, has filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his *pro se* application, petitioner challenges his conviction for assault with intent to commit murder, M.C.L.A. 750.83; assault with intent to commit great bodily harm, M.C.L.A. 750.84; felon in possession of a firearm, M.C.L.A. 750.224f; and felony-firearm, M.C.L.A. 750.227b. Having reviewed the petition, the Court will dismiss the petition without prejudice.

**I. Background**

Petitioner was convicted of the above offenses following a jury trial in the Wayne County Circuit Court. Petitioner’s conviction was affirmed on appeal. *People v. Meyers*, No. 285206 (Mich. Ct. App. October 31, 2008); *lv. den.* 483 Mich. 915; 762 N.W. 2d 479 (2009). Petitioner seeks a

writ of habeas corpus on the following grounds:

- I. My attorney should have requested [that] my trial be separate from my co-defendant.
- II. Witnesses did not show.
- III. Confrontation Clause [violation].
- IV. Victim perjured self when he “I.D.” [Sic] me.

## **II. Discussion**

The instant petition is subject to dismissal because it contains at least one, and possibly two, claims that have not been exhausted with the state courts.

As a general rule, a state prisoner seeking federal habeas relief must first exhaust his available state court remedies before raising a claim in federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b) and (c). *See Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270, 275-78 (1971). The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) preserves the traditional exhaustion requirement, which mandates dismissal of a habeas petition containing claims that a petitioner has a right to raise in the state courts but has failed to do so. *See Welch v. Burke*, 49 F. Supp. 2d 992, 998 (E.D. Mich. 1999). Although exhaustion is not a jurisdictional matter, “it is a threshold question that must be resolved” before a federal court can reach the merits of any claim contained in a habeas petition. *See Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F. 3d 410, 415 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). Therefore, each claim must be reviewed by a federal court for exhaustion before any claim may be reviewed on the merits by a federal court. *Id.* Federal district courts must dismiss mixed habeas petitions which contain both exhausted and unexhausted claims. *See Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 230 (2004) (citing *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 510, 522 (1982)); *See also Nasr v. Stegall*, 978 F. Supp. 714, 716 (E.D. Mich. 1997). The failure to exhaust state court

remedies may be raised *sua sponte* by a federal court. *See Benoit v. Bock*, 237 F. Supp. 2d 804, 806 (E.D. Mich. 2003); 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(3).

A habeas petitioner has the burden of proving that he has exhausted his state court remedies. *Sitto v. Bock*, 207 F. Supp. 2d 668, 675 (E.D. Mich. 2002). Federal habeas corpus relief is unavailable to a state prisoner who fails to allege that he has exhausted his available state court remedies. *See Granville v. Hunt*, 411 F. 2d 9, 11 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969). In the present case, the instant petition is subject to dismissal, because petitioner has failed to allege or indicate in his petition that he has exhausted his state court remedies with respect to all of his claims. *See Peralta v. Leavitt*, 56 Fed. Appx. 534, 535 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 2003); *Fast v. Wead*, 509 F. Supp. 744, 746 (N.D. Ohio 1981). Petitioner, in fact, acknowledges on the face of his petition that he did not exhaust his fourth claim involving perjured testimony on his direct appeal. Petitioner also indicates that he does not know whether he has exhausted his second claim on his direct appeal with the federal courts.

This Court concludes that at least one, and perhaps two, of petitioner's claims have not been exhausted, because they were not fairly presented with the state courts. A habeas petitioner may not present a "mixed" petition containing both exhausted and unexhausted claims to a federal court. *Rockwell v. Yukins*, 217 F.3d 421, 423 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). Although this requirement is not jurisdictional, a petition that includes unexhausted claims will ordinarily not be considered by a federal court absent exceptional or unusual circumstances. *Rockwell*, 217 F. 3d at 423.

The Court will dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus without prejudice. The Court will also deny a certificate of appealability. In order to obtain a certificate of appealability, a prisoner must make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To demonstrate this denial, the applicant is required to show that reasonable jurists

could debate whether the petition should have been resolved in a different manner, or whether the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). When a district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claims, a certificate of appealability should issue, and an appeal of the district court's order may be taken, if the petitioner shows that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Id.* When a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or that the petition should be allowed to proceed further. In such a circumstance, no appeal would be warranted. *Id.* "The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rule 11(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability, because "jurists of reason" would not find it debatable whether this Court was correct in its procedural ruling that petitioner failed to exhaust an available state court remedy with respect to his claims. *See Colbert v. Tambi*, 513 F. Supp. 2d 927, 939 (S.D. Ohio 2007). The Court will also deny petitioner leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal because such appeal would be frivolous. *Myers v. Straub*, 159 F. Supp. 2d 621, 629 (E.D. Mich. 2001).

### **III. ORDER**

Accordingly, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

The Court further **DENIES** a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Lawrence P. Zatkoff  
LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 17, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this Order was served upon the attorneys of record by electronic or U.S. mail on June 17, 2010.

S/Marie E. Verlinde  
Case Manager  
(810) 984-3290